7th December 1954]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" The Government are taking necessary steps with regard to the lands given by them. As regards the 'freehold land', about which hon. Member Sri S. Deivasigamany gave a definition of his own, I gave a definition from a practical point of view though it may not be a legal definition and I will examine it further."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" May I know from the Hon. Minister when and on what grounds such a large extent of land was leased out to the Catholic Fathers as 'freehold property'? May I also know from the Hon. Minister whether there are any proposals before the Government to resume the lands and distribute them among the landless and homeless people in the vicinity?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I do not know when so much land was given to the Catholic Fathers as 'freehold property', and the reasons for the same."

SRI A. RAMASAMY TEVAR :—" May I know from the Hon. Minister why some of the hon. Members are taking so much interest about the Catholic Fathers?"

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" The Hon. Minister has not answered my previous question. I am asking him why the Government gave the Catholic Fathers of a particular Order this concession of freedom from taxation and why it was that these particular people were allowed or continued to be allowed to hold the land as 'freehold property' without having to pay any tax to Government. Secondly I should like to know what is the purpose to which the Fathers are putting these lands."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" As regards the enjoyment of the 'freehold land' without paying tax to the Government, the concession was not given recently or even some time ago. I have no information on the subject. I can give an answer only about the land that the Government gave on lease. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants further information, I will obtain and give him."

Adoption of Government scales of pay for teachers in high schools.

* 110 *Q.*—SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of high schools in the State, if any, that do not adopt the Government scales of pay for the teachers;

(*b*) the annual grant they receive from the Government; and

(*c*) the reasons for their not adopting the Government scales of pay?

[7th December 1954

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" (a) One hundred and thirty secondary schools under local bodies and 248 secondary schools under aided managements, Sir.

" (b) Rs. 8,31,600 in respect of secondary schools under local bodies and Rs. 26,43,300 in respect of secondary schools under aided managements.

" (c) It is not obligatory on the part of the managements to adopt the Government scales of pay. The main reason for the reluctance of local bodies and private managements to adopt these scales is their inability to shoulder the additional financial liability even though Government aid is given in respect of private schools to meet a major portion of this additional cost."

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—" May I know from the Hon. Minister whether it is obligatory on the part of the Government to give grants at all to these schools which do not give the Government scales of pay to the teachers employed in them? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" We have given option to these schools to adopt the Government scales of pay or their own scales of pay and it is obligatory on the part of Government to give them the grants."

Dispute between the management and the workers of Sait Nagi Purushothama Company, Kozhikode, Malabar.

* 111 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Labour Officer, Malabar, has recommended to the Government to refer to the Tribunal for adjudication the labour dispute between the management and the workers of Sait Nagi Purushothama Company, Kozhikode, Malabar, regarding wage increase, bonus, medical and leave facilities, etc.; and

(b) if so, the action taken by the Government thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" (a) Recommendations, if any, of Labour Officers in such cases are confidential and cannot be divulged.

" (b) The Government considered that there was no case for adjudication. A suitable reply was sent to the Union."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—" May I know from the Hon. Minister the reasons for turning down the request of the Labour Union to refer to a Tribunal the adjudication of the labour dispute between the management and the workers? May I also know from the Hon. Minister details of the profits made by the Company? "

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" As regards the grant of bonus in 1951–52, the Government have found that there was no case for the grant of bonus to the workers as the Company had sustained a loss. As regards the bonus in